

### Remarks

Claims 1, 7, 9-10, 14, 16, 18 and 23 are amended herein. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the Application.

### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, Claims 7 and 16 are objected to for a formatting informality. Applicant has corrected the informality of Claims 7 and 16. Therefore, the objection with respect to Claims 7 and 16 is overcome.

### Rejection under 102(b)

#### Claims 1-3, 6-8, 9-11, 14-19 and 22-24

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 9-11, 14-19 and 22-24 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chernoff et al. (6000028). Applicant has reviewed Chernoff et al. and respectfully states that Chernoff et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 9, 14, 18 and 23 include the feature "an application code source stored on said server and not on said client." Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including Paragraphs 0031, 0032, 0033, and the like.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Chernoff et al. anticipates the feature of Claims 1, 9, 14, 18 and 23. Applicant understands Chernoff et al. to teach the Application code source stored on the client device. Moreover, Applicant understands Chernoff et al. to teach that the first run of the application on the client device the server will respond by indicating that there is no corresponding native image to execute. Therefore, Applicant understands Chernoff et al. to teach and anticipate the application code being stored on the client device and the server storing no information, or translations that have been performed on the application code stored on the device.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Chernoff et al. do not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 9, 14, 18 and 23, and as such, Claims 1, 9, 14, 18 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Chernoff et al. do not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 19, 22 and 24 which are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, 9, 14, 18 and 23 and that Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 19, 22 and 24 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15-17, 19, 22 and 24 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

#### Rejection under 103(a)

##### Claims 4, 12 and 20

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4, 12 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious in view of Chernoff et al. for the following rationale.

With respect to Claim 4, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 4 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 4 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

With respect to Claim 12, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 12 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 9 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 12 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

With respect to Claim 20, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 20 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 18 and recites further features of

the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 20 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claims 5, 13 and 21

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5, 13 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. and further in view of “Distributed Virtual Machines: A System Architecture For Network Computers” by Sirer, Grimm, Bershad, Gregory and McDirmid. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious in view of Chernoff et al. and further in view of “Distributed Virtual Machines: A System Architecture For Network Computers” by Sirer, Grimm, Bershad, Gregory and McDirmid for the following rationale.

With respect to Claim 5, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 5 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 5 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

With respect to Claim 13, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 13 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 9 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 13 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

With respect to Claim 21, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 21 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 18 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 21 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-24.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 12/23/04



John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060